DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 906 EA 017 565

AUTHOR Selove, Rebecca
TITLE Relationships among Teachers' Expectations and School Organizational Variables.
PUB DATE 25 Aug 84
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Elementary Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Participative Decision Making; Questionnaires; School Organization; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Influence; Teacher Participation; *Teacher Response; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS Tennessee; Vroom Expectancy Theory

ABSTRACT

The first of two questions investigated in this paper concerns the relationships among three measures of teachers' expectations: that their students can succeed, that they can be successful as teachers, and that they can influence what happens in their classrooms and schools. The second question involves relationships between these three types of expectations and teachers' perceptions of four characteristics of their school organizations: safety and order in the school, instructional leadership, rapport among teachers, and teacher participation in decision-making in their schools. Questionnaires with 85 items were completed by 1,058 teachers in 97 elementary schools in Tennessee. Outcomes relating teacher expectations to each of the above-mentioned characteristics of school organization are discussed. These outcomes underscored the importance of safety and orderliness for favorable teacher expectations. For efficacy, rapport among teachers was the most salient feature of school organization, and the second most important feature for predicting high expectations and locus of control. Two pages of references are included. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254906

Relationships Among Teachers' Expectations and School Organizational Variables

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rebecca J. Selove

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Rebecca Selove, Ph.D.
Virginia Beach City Public Schools
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

Presented as part of a symposium:

Improving Schools Through Incentives -

The School Improvement Incentives Project

American Psychological Association Annual Convention

Toronto, Ontario
August 25, 1984

EA 017 565.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This is an exciting point in time to be involved in a large scale educational research project.* The public school system represents a policy predicated on several powerful beliefs, among which are the following: as a society we have a duty to educate our citizens; people must be educated in order for government to truly be "by the people"; all children have an opportunity to acquire their version of the American dream via our public education system.

Elementary and secondary schools have been vested with a major role in our society, and many of us have beliefs and ideas about how schools should be operating to contribute to an improved society. Many civil rights activists hoped that desegregation of public schools would be followed by equalization of academic and social success for majority and minority culture children, and when that did not happen, investigators who did not want to accept that the fault lay within the children or their families, and could not be changed by the schools, as suggested by Coleman et al. (1966), were spurred to scrutinize the schools. This added steam to an already active educational research movement.

Many reviewers have summarized school effectiveness research, including Cohen (1981), Edmonds (1979), Mackenzie (1983), and Purkey and Smith (1982). They have noted a wealth of information from hundreds of investigations as well as the need for more research. Reviewers have called for integration of the literature (Bickel, 1983; Harrison, 1976; Murnane, 1980), more precise definitions of terms (Mackenzie, 1983), and practical steps that can be taken by schools in their efforts to improve their service (Silver, 1982).

* The School Improvement Incentives Project is being conducted by George Peabody College and The Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, with sponsorship by the Tennessee State Board of Education and with the assistance of a grant from the Lyndhurst Foundation. The Project is co-directed by Leonard Bickman and John Folger. (Contact Gay McRainey, Project Manager, School Improvement Incentives Project, 1208 18th Avenue South, Nashville, TN 37212 for further information.)

EST COPY AVAILABLE

What has been accomplished, most agree, is the tentative identification of important threads in the fabric of effective schools. The following five factors have been consistently emphasized; a safe and orderly school environment, strong instructional leadership, rapport among teachers, teacher participation in decision-making, and expectations for student success (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Mackenzie, 1983; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1982).

The topic of teacher expectations has been particular provocative, and at least three kinds of teacher expectations have been described. These include teachers' expectations about their students ability to do as well or better than other students, their own ability to be successful teachers, and their ability to influence what happens in their schools and classrooms (Fuller, Wood, Rapoport, & Dornbusch, 1982; Good & Brophy, 1978).

Expectancies, those states of mind in which future events are imagined and judged in terms of probabilities, are a major part of several theoretical frameworks. Within social learning theory, the focus has been on relatively enduring individual characteristics thought to relate to behavior, while from an organizational theory perspective, researchers have addressed expectations as they relate to motivation in the work setting. Both perspectives have been applied to research on school effectiveness. In addition, relatively recent school effectiveness research has incorporated as a category of expectations generalized beliefs about students' academic capabilities; specifically Brookover et al. (1983) asked teachers and principals to indicate the degree to which they believe that their students can do as well or better than the national average for academic achievement. They found this to be strongly correlated with student success.

A three-part model attributed to Vroom (1964), developed to explain motivation in work organizations, has appeared in various forms in social psychological literature and in educational research, and several different names have been given to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

model and its components. Three aspects of an individual's beliefs are considered in determining what Vroom (1964) called "force of motivation", i.e., the degree to which an individual believes working hard leads to good performance, which I call Expectancy; the degree to which good performance leads to specified rewards, which I call Instrumentality, and the attractiveness of each of the rewards, which Vroom (1964) and I call Valence. Force of motivation, according to Vroom's (1964) theory, is a function of the product of Valence times Instrumentality multiplied by Expectancy. Spector (1982), Fuller and colleagues (1982), and Cecil Miskel and colleagues (1982) have all incorporated this model in their investigations of public schools, although slight differences in terminology confuse the similarities. I have followed Fuller et al. (1982) in calling the total construct Efficacy, and I used the same terms for the three individual components as have been used by Miskel et al (1982).

Within social learning theory a particular kind of expectancy, locus of control, has emerged as the focus of hundreds of investigations, recently reviewed by Lefcourt (1982). In general, researchers have measured locus of control as internal, meaning that an individual expects to be able to influence outcomes, or external, meaning that an individual attributes outcomes to luck or to factors beyond his or her control (Lefcourt, 1982; Rotter, 1966).

Some investigatiors have distinguished between personal causation, or perception of relationships between one's own action and outcomes, and locus of control, or perception of relationships between actions and outcomes in general (deCharms, 1981). Gurin, Gurin, Lao, and Beattie (1969) suggest outcomes that are personal events easily influenced by an individual are different from system-wide events that are contingent on many complex factors. There is also evidence that locus of control measures are more useful when the outcome is specific rather than general (Lefcourt, 1982). Most locus of control research addresses a bipolar unidimensional construct with two extremes representing, on one hand, expecting to be able to influence events, and on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the other hand, expecting to be unable to influence events.

A number of teacher locus of control instruments have been used to investigate relationships among teachers' expectations regarding control of outcomes and students' achievement. Sadowski and Woodward (1982) developed a 20-item scale with a Likert-type response format. They have conducted several studies with this instrument, and have concluded that "students with more internally oriented teachers ... had higher grades than those with less internally oriented teachers" (Sadowski & Woodward, 1981, p. 1).

Bandura (1977) makes a distinction between efficacy expectations, that is, the degree of certainty that one can perform an act that will lead to an outcome, and outcome expectations, or the conviction that the action will lead to a specified outcome. Locus of control, then, is the outcome expectation. By focusing within the personal realm on the hertofore unasked question "Do you expect to be able to perform the action?" Bandura recognizes as a separate issue the locus of control question "Do you expect the performance of that action to lead to the specified outcome?" Thus, Bandura (1977, 1982) has taken an important step in specifying aspects of individuals' beliefs with regard to expectations. It seems to me that Bandura's construct of "self-efficacy" is similar to what I call Expectancy in the three-part model discussed earlier.

I have described to you three kinds of expectations: first, high expectations, the general beliefs investigated by Brookover et al. (1979); second, what I call efficacy expectations, the three-part model based on Vroom's (1964) work; and locus of control, a social learning bipolar construct. The first question I asked in my research was, are these three constructs distinct enough to warrant separate attention? Is it a mistake to lump research using the different constructs together under the label of teachers' expectations? I also wondered to what extent they are similar, and I expected low but positive correlations between high expectations, efficacy,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and locus of control. I measured all three constructs with five-point Likert scales, adapting or adopting items from Brookover et al. (1979) for high expectations, from Miskel et al. (1982) for Efficacy subscales, and from Sadowski and Woodward (1981) for teachers' locus of control.

Questionnaires that were administered to 1,638 teachers in 97 elementary schools in Tennessee as part of the School Improvement Incentives Project provided data for the investigation. Individual teachers' responses were eliminated from specific statistical analyses if any item contributing to a scale in the analysis was scored as invalid. Although the number of completely valid questionnaires was 1, 058, some statistics reported are based on a higher number of respondents because all scales were not part of that particular analysis.

Analysis of differences between teachers who completed all 85 items constituting the scales used in this study and those who failed to give a valid response to one or more item resulted in three statistically significant findings ($p < .001$). More non-Caucasians did not respond to one or more items; the mean age for those who completed all items was 36, while for the second group it was 39; the average number of years at the current school was slightly lower - approximately seven years-for those who responded completely in comparison to the second group, whose members had been at their current school an average of eight years.

As a prelude to procedures that are appropriate for measures with linear relationships among them, eta statistics were calculated among the three measures of expectations. If means of the dependent variables were similar across categories of the independent variable, as is the case if the relationship between them is similar, then eta, which can range from 0 to 1, would be small. The results of the analyses do not suggest curvilinear relationships among the measures of expectations.

Results of analyses of relationships among the three measures of teachers' expectations, including their expectations that their students can succeed, that they

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

can be successful as teachers, and that they can influence what happens in their classrooms and schools, indicate significant correlations ranging from .30 to .51 (see Table 1). It appears that although these expectations are related to one another, the degree of overlap is low enough to warrant their being recognized as different constructs.

The second question addressed by my research involved relationships between these three types of expectations and teachers' perceptions of five characteristics of their school organizations. These are safety and order in the school, instructional leadership, rapport among teachers, teacher participation in decision-making, and teachers' satisfaction with decision-making in their school.

A number of investigators have declared that a minimum requirement for an effective school is an environment that is safe and in which disciplinary problems are few (Edmonds, 1979; Miskel, 1982). The safety and orderliness of the school environment allows for freedom from certain stresses and maximizes time for academic tasks (Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983).

A second important quality of an effective school is strong instructional leadership (Cohen, 1981; Mackenzie, 1983). Coordination of academic goals within a school, observation of teachers, and facilitation of discussions about ways to improve educational programs for specific children are explicit responsibilities of someone, usually the principal, in schools in which children demonstrate academic success (Edmonds, 1979; Miskel, 1982).

Another frequently noted characteristic of effective schools is the degree of cooperation among staff members. Shared goals and emphasis on similiar kinds of skills at a school-wide level contribute to a climate in which teachers are able to use each other as resources (Edmonds, 1979; Rowan et al., 1983).

Participation in decision-making is a fourth characteristic of staff behavior in schools in which children's academic achievement is at or above national norms (Phi Delta Kappa, 1980; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). As another

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

element in the overall climate of a school, opportunities to participate in making decisions that affect one's job correlate with the previously described degree of cooperation among staff in a school. Satisfaction with decision-making is considered as a complement of participation in the process of making decisions, as lack of satisfaction with the process would seem to cancel out the positive affect assumed to be generated by being involved in the process.

Although there has been specualtion concerning the ways in which organizational variables influence teachers' classroom behaviors (Bishop, 1977; Fuller et al., 1982; Herrick, 1974), there have been few investigations of the ways in which perceived characteristics of the school environment correlate with teachers' attitudes about their own work and their students' performance. No research has attempted to discern relationships between school organizational characteristics and different kinds of teacher expectations.

I expected to find that safety and orderliness is positively related to all three kinds of expectations, that participation in decision-making is negatively associated with efficacy expectations, and that satisfaction with decision making is positively associated with internal locus of control, based on theoretical relationships described in the literature.

The outcomes of this investigation underscored the importance of safety and orderliness for favorable teacher expectations. With the exception of efficacy, safety and orderliness was the best predictor of expectations, as demonstrated in the results of canonical correlational analysis as well as stepwise and hierarchical regressions (Table 2,3, and 4). For efficacy, rapport among teachers was the most salient feature of the school organization; furthermore, this quality was the second-most important feature for predicting high expectations and locus of control. Thus, it appears that if school improvement efforts are to influence teachers' expectations the two most likely candidates among the organizational variables studied are these two variables. In other words, efforts to change teachers' expectations in order to improve

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students' academic performance should begin with interventions aimed at improving the level of perceived safety and orderliness in the school, and influencing the perceived quality of teachers' relationships with each other. The evidence which has been provided to support such efforts is correlational, and it is likely that several characteristics of teachers and school environments continuously influence each other.

The role of the principal as instructional leader appeared to be insignificant in explaining teachers' expectations. It may be that someone other than the principal provides instructional leadership in the study schools. This possibility should be addressed in future research.

Participation in decision making added little or nothing to the predictive power of the equation except in the case of efficacy, where it tied with safety and orderliness in the environment in predictive power. Perhaps in school organizations the decisions that are most relevant to teachers' attitudes are those made at the classroom level. In this investigation, decisions related to school-wide events, which may be perceived as less relevant to the day-to-day activities of a teacher, appeared to have little or no relationship to teachers' expectations.

The hypothesized relationship between satisfaction with decision making and locus of control was not supported by the data. The scales used for measuring these two constructs addressed somewhat different concerns, and may have shown stronger association if there had been more overlap in the item contents.

It may also be that teachers' locus of control orientation functions independently of their satisfaction with decision-making in their school. They may maintain their beliefs about their control over classroom outcomes regardless of their attitudes about decisions made at the school-wide level.

I conclude that high expectations, efficacy, and locus of control are different kinds of expectations. I believe that future research should address these expectations with even finer definitional distinctions. Clearer specification of target

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

attitudes within schools will facilitate development of strategies for changing school faculty and administrators' expectations.

Furthermore, I conclude that efforts to change teachers' expectations in order to improve students' academic performance should begin with efforts to improve safety and order as well as teachers' perception that they are working together toward common goals. It seems to me that the School Improvement Incentives Project is especially well-designed to facilitate teacher rapport.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE I

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THREE MEASURES OF EXPECTATIONS

High Expectations	.40 (N=1,346)	.30 (N=1,406)
Efficacy		.51 (N=1,345)

$P < .001$ for all coefficients

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Fsychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bickel, W.E. (1983). Effective schools: Knowledge, dissemination, inquiry. Educational Researcher, 12, 3-17.

Brookover, W.B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: J.F. Bergin Publishers.

Cohen, M. (1981). Effective schools: What research says. Today's Education, 70, 58GS-61GS.

Coleman, J.S. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

deCharms, R. (1981). Personal causation and locus of control. Two different traditions and two uncorrelated measures. In H.M. Lefcourt (Ed.), Research with the locus control construct. (Vol.1). New York: Academic Press.

Edmonds, R.R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 9, 28-32.

Fuller, B., Wood, K., Rapoport, T., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1982). The organizational context of individual efficacy. Review of Educational Research, 52, 7-30.

Good, T.L. & Brophy, J.E. (1978). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. (1969). Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 29-53.

Harrison, M. (1976). Class achievement and the background and behavior of teachers. The Elementary School Journal, 77. 63-70

Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research (2nd ed.). Hillside, NJ: L. Erlbaum Assoc.

MacKenzie, D.E. (1983). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends. Educational REsearcher, 12, 3-17.

Miskel, C., Bloom, S., & McDonald, D. (1982). Effects of structural coupling and expectancy climate on the effectiveness of learning strategies intervention: A pilot study to establish reliability and validity estimates. Lawrence, KS: Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Murnane, R.J. (1980). Interpreting the evidence on school effectiveness. New Haven, CT: Institute for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University.

Murphy, J.F., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1982). Academic press: Translating high expectations into school policies and classroom practices. Educational Leadership, 40, 22-26.

Phi Delta Kappa. (1980). Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa study of exceptional urban elementary schools. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa and Indiana University.

Purkey, S.C., & Smith, M.S. (1982). Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 64-69.

Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-28.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S.T., & Dwyer, D.C. (1983). Research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 64-69.

Rutter, M., Maugham, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sadowski, C.J., Taylor, R.C., Woodward, H.R., Peacher, R.K. & Martin, J.B. (1982). The reliability and validity of a Likert-type locus of control scale for teachers. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 12(32).

Silver, P.F. (1982). Synthesis of research on teacher motivation. Educational Leadership, 40, 551-555.

Spector, P.E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 482-497.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II

FIRST CANONICAL VARIATE COEFFICIENTS AND THEIR CORRELATION WITH ORIGINAL VARIABLES

Variable	First Canonical Variate Coefficient	Correlation with Original Variables
First Set		
Safe and orderly environment	.61	.86
Instructional leadership	-.07	.50
Teacher rapport	.54	.84
Participation in decision making	.18	.43
Satisfaction with decision making	-.06	.44
Second Set		
High expectations	.76	.93
Efficacy	.35	.70
Locus of control	.10	.50

First canonical correlation = .58, $p < 0.001$.

Second canonical correlation = .20, $p < 0.001$.

Third canonical correlation = .02, $p = .89$.

$N = 1,058$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III

STEPWISE REGRESSION OF MEASURES OF EXPECTATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES

Measure of Expectations	Organizational Variable	Simple R	Multiple R	Cumulative R^2	Beta Weights	F
High Expectations:	Safe and orderly environment	.45	.45	.20	.36	
	Teacher rapport	.39	.49	.24	.24	
	Instructional leadership	.21	.49	.24	-.10	
	Participation in decision making	.18	.50	.25	.07	
	Satisfaction with decision making	.19	.50	.25	-.02	34.46*[1]
Efficacy:	Teacher rapport	.39	.39	.15	.25	
	Participation in decision making	.26	.42	.18	.13	
	Safe and orderly environment	.32	.44	.20	.13	
	Instructional leadership	.31	.45	.20	.07	32.83*[2]
Locus of Control:	Safe and orderly environment	.29	.29	.08	.20	
	Teacher rapport	.28	.33	.11	.19	
	Participation in decision making	.12	.33	.11	.04	
	Instructional leadership	.17	.33	.11	-.03	16.24*[2]

Note. Even numbered cases were selected for these analyses. N = 533.

*$p < .01$.

[1]Equation includes five variables.

[2]Equation includes four variables.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE IV

HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION OF MEASURES OF EXPECTATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES

Measure of Expectations	Organizational Variable	Simple R	Multiple R	Cumulative R^2	Beta Weights	F
High Expectations:	Safe and orderly environment	.51	.51	.26	.39	
	Teacher rapport	.48	.58	.33	.32	
	Instructional leadership	.26	.58	.34	-.07	
	Participation in decision making	.24	.59	.34	.09	
	Satisfaction with decision making	.25	.59	.35	-.04	54.85*[1]
Efficacy:	Teacher rapport	.35	.35	.12	.22	
	Participation in decision making	.20	.37	.14	.07	
	Safe and orderly environment	.32	.41	.16	.17	
	Instructional leadership	.29	.41	.17	.08	26.47*[2]
Locus of Control:	Safe and orderly environment	.21	.21	.05	.18	
	Teacher rapport	.21	.25	.06	.16	
	Participation in decision making	.09	.25	.06	.04	
	Instructional leadership	.07	.26	.07	-.10	9.47*[2]

Note. Odd numbered cases were selected for these analyses. N = 533.

*$p < .01$.

[1]Equation includes five variables.

[2]Equation includes four variables.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE